

## The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1882.

## Announcements To-Day.

Academy of Music—Les Horreurs
Ashley's Park Theatre—The Hunter's Return
Bijou Opera House—Spanish
Booth's Theatre—Spartacus, Matador
Brooklyn Park Theatre—Interviews, Matador
Brown's Theatre—Tuesday and Wednesday
Chichester Hall—Ghosts
Daly's Theatre—Oldame, Romeo
Grand Opera House—Paul de Saxe, Matador
Hancock's Alibi's Garden—La Boheme, Matador
Harrigan's Theatre—The Queen of Spain, Matador
Harrigan's Theatre—As You Like It, Matador
Madison Square Theatre—Faulkner, Matador
San Francisco Minstrels—Invitation to a Ball
Standard Theatre—Cinderella, Matador
Theatre Francaise—Dionysus
Times Square Theatre—Spanish
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Patmos
Union Square Theatre—The Little Queen, Matador
Wallock's Theatre—Yester
Windham's Theatre—All the Rage, Matador

## Advertisement Rates.

Ordinary Advertisements, per Agate Line.....	\$0.60
Large type or cuts, Agate measurement per line.....	0.90
Business Notices, before inauguration and death, per line.....	0.75
Spec. Notices after inaugurations and deaths, per line.....	0.75
Banking and Financial advertisements, per line.....	0.75
Reading Notices with "Ad." 30¢ per line, 1.50	
Reading Notices with "Ad." 1st or 2d page, per line.....	1.50
In Sunday edition same rates as above.....	2.50

## Subscription Rates.

DAILY—16 pages, by mail, \$5.00 a month, or \$60.00 a year, postpaid; with Sunday edition, \$7.70.
SUNDAY—8 pages, \$1.20 per year, postpaid.
WEEKLY—8 pages, \$1 per year, postpaid.

## A Contrast.

The following statement of notorious facts we find in the columns of the *St. Louis Post-Democrat*:

"Some twenty years ago CONKLING, BLAINE, SHERMAN, ALLISON, WISDOM, and WILSON were all Republican members of the House together. They were all poor at that time, but their names were well known. At one time, Allison in the Senate was another millionaire. Wilson is today a millionaire. WISDOM is a millionaire. WILSON got to be very rich. WILSON CONKLING—the ablest, greatest, profound of them all—is poor to-day."

These six public men, all Republicans, are nearly of the same age and they have all been engaged in active politics since they entered Congress together. Five of them, pursuing the same career, and with no opportunity to acquire fortune, in my regular profession, have become very wealthy, four of the number being reckoned as millionaires.

CONKLING alone of the six, with the same chances before him, concerned in the same legislation, and more conspicuous and influential than the others, is in straitened means and goes back to the law to earn an honorable livelihood.

This contrast is striking, but it is evidently to the credit of the former Senator from New York, who, whatever may have been his faults as a leader, was never accused of venality, and whose whole record in Congress is unstained.

BLAINE, ALLISON, SHERMAN, WISDOM, and WILSON, on the other hand, have all been investigated in one form or another, and they have all had need of vindication. Their lives and their success reveal the sources of wealth at Washington, and make plain the character of legislation by which needy Congressmen have become millionaires.

## The Secret Naturalization of Mayor Grace.

An extraordinary act on the part of the Hon. WILLIAM R. GRACE, now Mayor of the city of New York, was made public yesterday.

From the records of the Court of Common Pleas it appears that he applied for naturalization and was naturally admitted to become a citizen of the United States on the first day of November, 1880; that is to say, only one day before he was elected Mayor of this city.

He would have been ineligible to that office unless he was a citizen of the State of New York on election day. "No person shall be capable of holding a civil office," say the Revised Statutes, "when the time of his election or appointment shall not have attained the age of twenty-one years, and who shall not then be a citizen of this State."

To be a citizen of this State, he must be a citizen of the United States. No State can make the subject of a foreign prince a citizen in any other mode than that provided by the naturalization laws of Congress. This was held by Mr. Justice MILLER of the Supreme Court of the United States, sitting at Circuit in Minnesota in 1876.

It was essential, therefore, to the political ambition of Mr. GRACE that he should have been admitted to citizenship before the morning of election day. Throughout the campaign doubts had been expressed from time to time as to the validity of his alleged naturalization as a minor resident in 1867. Those appear to have disturbed his friends so seriously that they induced him to apply for a second order, on the very eve of the election, admitting him to be a citizen.

The proceeding, if not secret, was so well concealed that the facts have been withheld from publicity for many months. And no wonder; for they apparently involve the admission that Mr. GRACE ran for Mayor under a false pretense as to his citizenship.

The naturalization of 1867 had been questioned because of assertions that at that time Mr. GRACE could not have fulfilled the required conditions of residence. In spite of his sworn statement on Dec. 30, in that year, that he had resided in the United States three years next preceding his arrival at the age of twenty-one, and five years within the country, including two years of this minority, and one year immediately preceding his application within the State of New York, there were those who still insisted that he was more of a Peruvian than an American during the periods mentioned, and that his residence here was technical rather than actual.

We submit that the working force of a department which allows documents to be abstracted from its files, and artfully erases names from papers whose disclosure is compulsory, has by no means any presumption of vigilance and good faith in its favor. When, therefore, we point out that, instead of transmitting "all the correspondence" between the State Department saw fit to exercise a power of selection, and to omit no less than 25 letters, viz., 17 from BLAINE and 8 from HILTON, we are not to be told by men who thought Senator BLAINE's name irrelevant that all these papers were withheld on the score of irrelevancy. Of these 27 letters 8 are specifically mentioned by an esteemed contemporary as relating to matters of small moment. We trust the statements rest on some better foundation than the assertion of the department employees, which as we have seen in the case of the suppressed names, is of small value. We repeat what we said on Monday: Let the committee insist on the production of the 27 withheld letters belonging to the HILTON correspondence, and determine for themselves whether they are devoid of all significance in regard to the Peruvian scandal.

While the chief clerk and custodian of the State Department records are on the stand, it may be well for the committee to give them also a chance to show that our reference to the failure of the official documents to throw any light on the Monroe contract with the Credit Industrial is a mere nest. It is certain that for the settling of the contract, communicated by a private hand to the *Boston Advertiser*, the public would have known nothing of a transaction by which a United States Minister agreed to go into the guano business. Let Messrs. HASWELL and BROWN be vigorously interrogated touching the existence of papers relating or relating to the Monroe contract of the department. It is certainly expressed that without this support, or an equivalent from private capital, it will go down, as it does not pay. But before that event we shall find it knocking loudly at the doors of Congress for subsidy.

Grocers of tobacco are the only persons in the country who cannot dispose of their crop how and where they please. A farmer cannot sell a few pounds of tobacco to a neighbor for a sheep, was without paying a special tax, and thoughtless infractions of the law have caused him to be carried hundreds of miles away from home to stand trial for their offense. A farmer cannot sell his tobacco at all save to a licensed dealer or by himself getting a license. The tax imposed is a revenue of \$30,000,000, and it is estimated that it costs \$100,000 a year to collect this.

The Mayor told our reporter yesterday that he had no doubt in his own mind that he was properly naturalized in 1867. But he has manifested the gravest possible doubt to the whole world by being naturalized over again. And whatever doubt there is relates to the truthfulness of his own sworn statements concerning his residence in this country. If they were true, the naturalization of 1867 was unimpeachable. The Mayor talks about acting under the advice of eminent counsel; but did they succeed in convincing him that he might not have told the truth fifteen years ago?

The records indicate and the Mayor says that the papers used in 1867 were in 1880 deemed equivalent to the prior declaration of intention required by law. We think it extremely questionable whether they were properly so regarded.

The improvidence of the whole proceeding is clearly brought out in the interview with Mr. GRACE which we print this morning. He appears to be fully conscious of it himself. Otherwise he would scarcely concede that public knowledge of his second naturalization would have kept him out of the

Mayoralty. "Of course, if the thing had been publicly done," he says, "a few days before election, and published, I should have been defeated." These very words are an acknowledgment that it was secretly done.

As to his final assertion that the second naturalization "was done on behalf of the Democratic party as a party," it must be pronounced absurd.

## Not Behind Closed Doors.

The House committee of inquiry may as well understand that the people of this country will not tolerate a mock investigation of the Peruvian scandals.

The committee was appointed to bring the whole truth, not to satisfy the grudge of one nation against another, or to shield any man or set of men from censure.

It would have been a public calamity had the voters of Northampton failed to represent the violation of the rights of their constituency, and to compel the definite settlement of the constitutional question raised by this interesting case.

It seems probable, however, from the proceedings in the House of Commons on Monday evening, that the adjustment of this matter may be considerably delayed by the inability of Mr. GLADSTONE to control his party.

Had the Premier taken at the first stage of the case the same judicious attitude which he assumed on Monday, and made the adoption of his advice a test of party fealty, the last vestige of religious disabilities would have been wiped off the statute book, and

Mr. BRADLAUGH would have long since occupied his seat in Parliament. When Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOCK moved that the House reaffirm its resolution of Feb. 7, which was of questionable legality—"that the member elect for Northampton be not permitted to go through the form of pronouncing the Parliamentary oath," a Liberal member, Mr. MAJORAKS, suggested an amendment in favor of legislation permitting affirmation. There was a great deal to be said for this amendment, both on constitutional grounds and on the score of expediency, since Mr. LABOUCHERE covenanted that, should it be carried, and the pledge of suitable legislation be fulfilled within a reasonable time, Mr. BRADLAUGH would give up his seat.

The actual working of so-called secret investigations has been made unpleasantly familiar by past experience. Nominally, the representatives of the press are excluded, but practically one or two favored newspapers are put in possession of such facts as members of the committee may think convenient to make public. It is reported, for instance, by one of our esteemed contemporaries that the House committee on Monday questioned Mr. BROWNS, chief clerk, and Mr. HASWELL, custodian of the records. In the State Department, concerning the missing documents in the Peruvian correspondence, and that, on hearing these gentlemen, the committee imputed no blame to them for the losses. On whom, then, should censure fall? If the chief clerk and the custodian of records are not responsible for the abstraction of papers from the files, who is? It appears, too, that these employees, who should apparently be regarded as precious heirlooms from the BLAINE administration, explain the withholding of numerous documents by the ground of "irrelevancy," and with an air of superior intelligence and virtue, denounce THE SUN's reference to these omissions as a mere rest. Let us look at the past performances of these gentlemen, and see how far a presumption of official vigilance and integrity has been established in their favor. The obvious result that Mr. BRADLAUGH loses his seat because the Clerk is forbidden to swear him in, while his own administrators are to be blamed for his conduct, is that the majority of the members of the committee will be inclined to make up their minds to the contrary.

The chief clerk and custodian of the records are the officers specially responsible for the preservation of the documents belonging to the State Department. By their own confession, however, five papers belonging to the SHIFFORD correspondence, and which from their description in the index must have been of more than usual interest, were removed from the files under their charge.

This abstraction must have been performed either with their knowledge or without it. In the latter case, they are guilty of gross remissness; in the former, of rank complicity. Careful employees do not lose important documents, nor would honest men permit them to be stolen by men purporting to exert superior authority.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the press are so numerous and forcible that the committee of inquiry will do well to accept any of their statements without a strict verification.

The chief clerk and custodian of the records are the officers specially responsible for the preservation of the documents belonging to the State Department. By their own confession, however, five papers belonging to the SHIFFORD correspondence, and which from their description in the index must have been of more than usual interest, were removed from the files under their charge.

This abstraction must have been performed either with their knowledge or without it. In the latter case, they are guilty of gross remissness; in the former, of rank complicity. Careful employees do not lose important documents, nor would honest men permit them to be stolen by men purporting to exert superior authority.

The suggestions made by the advisory committee yesterday by the Board of Trade and Transportation, while raising questions of great interest, are not calculated to promote the abrogation of differential rates. Indeed, they propose that such differential rates should be established as would result from basing charges upon actual cost of service, and that a cost less to every grain to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to New York, these rates to those cities should be proportionately lower.

The suggestion that the rates should be claimed by those on the ground that they are nearer to the West, and their track transverse coal fields, affording cheap fuel.

New York truck roads claim the advantage on the ground of having easier grades, so that a given amount of motive power will accomplish more work than on the other roads. The question is complicated, and it does not appear that its settlement is necessary to the present case. Even if it should appear that Western products could be carried to Baltimore at a little less cost than to New York, that is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price. If the railroads are able to defend up the grade, and to make up the difference in cost, there is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the press are so numerous and forcible that the committee of inquiry will do well to accept any of their statements without a strict verification.

The suggestions made by the advisory committee of the Board of Trade and Transportation, while raising questions of great interest, are not calculated to promote the abrogation of differential rates. Indeed, they propose that such differential rates should be established as would result from basing charges upon actual cost of service, and that a cost less to every grain to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to New York, these rates to those cities should be proportionately lower.

The suggestion that the rates should be claimed by those on the ground that they are nearer to the West, and their track transverse coal fields, affording cheap fuel.

New York truck roads claim the advantage on the ground of having easier grades, so that a given amount of motive power will accomplish more work than on the other roads. The question is complicated, and it does not appear that its settlement is necessary to the present case. Even if it should appear that Western products could be carried to Baltimore at a little less cost than to New York, that is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price. If the railroads are able to defend up the grade, and to make up the difference in cost, there is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the press are so numerous and forcible that the committee of inquiry will do well to accept any of their statements without a strict verification.

The suggestions made by the advisory committee of the Board of Trade and Transportation, while raising questions of great interest, are not calculated to promote the abrogation of differential rates. Indeed, they propose that such differential rates should be established as would result from basing charges upon actual cost of service, and that a cost less to every grain to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to New York, these rates to those cities should be proportionately lower.

The suggestion that the rates should be claimed by those on the ground that they are nearer to the West, and their track transverse coal fields, affording cheap fuel.

New York truck roads claim the advantage on the ground of having easier grades, so that a given amount of motive power will accomplish more work than on the other roads. The question is complicated, and it does not appear that its settlement is necessary to the present case. Even if it should appear that Western products could be carried to Baltimore at a little less cost than to New York, that is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price. If the railroads are able to defend up the grade, and to make up the difference in cost, there is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the press are so numerous and forcible that the committee of inquiry will do well to accept any of their statements without a strict verification.

The suggestions made by the advisory committee of the Board of Trade and Transportation, while raising questions of great interest, are not calculated to promote the abrogation of differential rates. Indeed, they propose that such differential rates should be established as would result from basing charges upon actual cost of service, and that a cost less to every grain to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to New York, these rates to those cities should be proportionately lower.

The suggestion that the rates should be claimed by those on the ground that they are nearer to the West, and their track transverse coal fields, affording cheap fuel.

New York truck roads claim the advantage on the ground of having easier grades, so that a given amount of motive power will accomplish more work than on the other roads. The question is complicated, and it does not appear that its settlement is necessary to the present case. Even if it should appear that Western products could be carried to Baltimore at a little less cost than to New York, that is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price. If the railroads are able to defend up the grade, and to make up the difference in cost, there is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the press are so numerous and forcible that the committee of inquiry will do well to accept any of their statements without a strict verification.

The suggestions made by the advisory committee of the Board of Trade and Transportation, while raising questions of great interest, are not calculated to promote the abrogation of differential rates. Indeed, they propose that such differential rates should be established as would result from basing charges upon actual cost of service, and that a cost less to every grain to Baltimore and Philadelphia than to New York, these rates to those cities should be proportionately lower.

The suggestion that the rates should be claimed by those on the ground that they are nearer to the West, and their track transverse coal fields, affording cheap fuel.

New York truck roads claim the advantage on the ground of having easier grades, so that a given amount of motive power will accomplish more work than on the other roads. The question is complicated, and it does not appear that its settlement is necessary to the present case. Even if it should appear that Western products could be carried to Baltimore at a little less cost than to New York, that is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price. If the railroads are able to defend up the grade, and to make up the difference in cost, there is no reason why they should not be carried to New York at the same price.

The majority against the Government, however, on this question was but fifteen, and it is to be hoped that this will speedily give way under the growing pressure of public opinion. Indeed, the representations of the